



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,588	06/08/2000	Akira Kitamura	1197-00	1857
35811	7590	02/25/2004	EXAMINER	
IP DEPARTMENT OF PIPER RUDNICK LLP 3400 TWO LOGAN SQUARE 18TH AND ARCH STREETS PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			DANG, THUAN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/589,588

Applicant(s)

KITAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Thuan D. Dang

Art Unit

1764

*eb*

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/22/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,6 and 11-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,6 and 11-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1764

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 1, there is no support for the limitations “from 5 to 80% by weight of” which is referred to **benzene and other aromatic hydrocarbons**, and “to convert at least a portion”.

Regarding claims 1, 5, 6, 11, and 13-15, the words “refined” or “refining” clearly has no support from the specification since the claimed process is a chemical process. Refining is chemical industry is a chemical process. This term carries a chemical meaning. If so, a refining reaction step has no support from the specification.

Nowhere in the specification support such a refined starting material as called for in the claims.

The examiner notes that nowhere in the specification discloses a “**refined**” (emphasis added) material has a characteristics as recited in claim 11-15.

Art Unit: 1764

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 3, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is inconsistent with itself since if a starting feed containing 1% by weight (at least 1%), the step of lowering is not necessary to make a refined starting material having a containing 1% by weight (or less).

Claim 14 and 15 are so confusing and inconsistent with claim 1 since claim 1 recites a starting material having more than 10% by weight of non-aromatic hydrocarbons in the starting material.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al (5,952,535) alternatively in consideration with the admitted art disclosed in the specification of this application.

King discloses a process of transalkylation (selected species) comprising contacting a starting material containing C<sub>9</sub>+ aromatics and benzene and a very minor amount of non-aromatic compounds, namely 0.74 (**mole** %) (not including benzene) in the presence of hydrogen and a catalyst containing MOR and 0.25 wt% of a metal such as Re to convert benzene and other aromatics to a product containing C<sub>7-8</sub> aromatics (the abstract; col. 3, lines 7-30; col. 4, lines 25-49; col. 8, lines 20-35).

The examiner notes that while applicants claim using a starting feed containing at least 1% by weight which is distilled to reduce its content of non-aromatics in the feed of 1 % by weight or less (see the above 112 rejection), King discloses using a feed a very minor amount of non-aromatic compounds, namely 0.74 % by **mole** (not including benzene) (see the entire patent for details).

The examiner cannot decide if 0.74 % by mole of non-aromatic is less than 1% by weight in the King feed or not. However, the examiner believes that if this weight amount were greater than 1 %, it would be very close to it.

Assuming arguendo that 0.74 % by mole of non-aromatics in the King feed were greater than 1 wt% in the King feed based on weight, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the King process by using a feed containing less than 1 wt% of non-aromatics or removing this minor amount to less than 1 wt% to arrive at the applicants' claimed process by well-known distillation separation method since it has been established by the patent law that if range of prior art and claimed range do not overlap, obviousness may still exist if the ranges are close enough that one would not expect a difference in properties. *In re Woodruff* 16 USPQ 2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *Titanium Metals Corp. V. Banner* 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Allers*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955).

As discussed above, the transalkylation feedstock of King requires only a minor amount of non-aromatics and one having ordinary skill in the art has recognized that the benzene fraction extracted from gasoline contains a large amount of non-aromatics (the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 of the specification of this application).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the King process by employing the benzene fraction derived from gasoline in the place of the benzene feed in the King process since it is expected that using of any benzene for the transalkylation with other higher aromatics in the King process yields similar results.

Art Unit: 1764

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made by further modified the King process by removing any non-aromatics from the mixture of benzene and the C9 aromatics by any separation method such as distillation as discussed above to arrive at the applicants' claimed process since the transalkylation feed of King requires only a minor amount of non-aromatics.

Regarding claim 11, King appears to disclose a feed containing a low concentration of xylene.

Regarding claim 12, the temperature and pressure can be found on column 9, lines 10-35.

The ratio of hydrogen and the hydrocarbons can be found on column 9, lines 27-28.

Regarding claims 14 and 15, a review of 112 rejection is necessary.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The argument that page 11 of the specification support the limitation "the benzene content of the aromatic hydrocarbon material may fall generally between 5 and 80% by weight" is not persuasive since in the claim, applicants claim "wherein said aromatic hydrocarbons comprises from 5 to 80% by weight of benzene **and** other aromatic hydrocarbons" (emphasis added by the examiner).

The argument that "to convert at least a portion" language is inherently present in claim 1 as it was originally filed is not persuasive since original claim 1 does not support such a language (see original claim 1). Applicants further define the meaning of some words such as

Art Unit: 1764

“diminishing” mean reducing, but not eliminating. However, the definition cannot be used to support the improper amendment.

Applicants discuss the support of claim 11-15 on page 5 of the amendment paper by indicating locations in the specification. However, the examiner maintains that the specification does not support a refined material (distilled material) has characteristics as recited in the claims.

The argument that King uses a relatively pure starting material is correct. Therefore, as discussed in the above rejection, in the industry, the benzene fraction extracted from gasoline contains a large amount of non-aromatics (the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 of the specification of this application). Once, the material is used for King process, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the King by removing these non-aromatics to make the impure material suitable for the King process by well-known separation methods such as distillation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan D. Dang whose telephone number is 571-272-1445. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 571-272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.




Art Unit: 1764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thuan D. Dang  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1764

09589588.20040216  
February 16, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thuan D. Dang', is written over the printed name and title.